arXiv:1605.08494v2 [cs.SI] 30 May 2016

Mixtape Application:
Music map methodology and evaluation

Pedro H. F. Holanda **Bruno Guilherme** **Luciana Fujii**
Ana Paula C. da Silva **Olga Goussevskaia**

Computer Science Department
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil

holanda@dcc.ufmg.br, brunoguilherme@dcc.ufmg.br, lucianafujii@dcc.ufmg.br
ana.coutosilva@dcc.ufmg.br, olga@dcc.ufmg.br

May 25, 2016

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Methodology **4**
2.1 Cosine similarity 4
2.2 Embedding techniques 5
2.2.1 Isomap 5
2.2.2 L-Isomap 5

3 TV Domain **7**
3.1 Gender-based evaluation 7

4 Music Domain **10**

5 Conclusion **14**

Chapter 1

Introduction

In the old days, people used to store their media collections (books, music records, video tapes, etc) in dedicated cabinets or shelves, sometimes as part of the home decoration. The organization would be done alphabetically or chronologically. With the advent of digital media and compressed file formats, media items have become digital files, stored in extensive hierarchies of directories on personal computers and, later, on portable mobile devices, such as e-readers and media players. Nowadays, the portable player has fused with the smartphone and media collections have been migrating into the cloud.

Internet storage and streaming services, like digital libraries, Youtube, Instagram, Spotify and Google Music, have become the state-of-the-art in terms of storage and access to media collections. They allow users to upload their content into the cloud and browse it from any device or, for a monthly fee, have unlimited access to the entire cloud.

To explore the vast content of ever growing personal collections and of the cloud, there is a necessity of developing novel ways to navigate these media files. Navigation functions typically available are based on filtering by attributes, like title, artist or genre, or return a list of similar items, computed using collaborative filtering techniques. Some systems, after a user has used them for long enough, are able to make taste-based recommendations based on usage patterns. Other systems are based on curated lists of newly released and trending items or artists, such as the user-made playlists on mixcloud[1] or the professional dj-curated streams on 22tracks[2].

Our approach to organize these media items is to look at how people behave on the internet - more specifically on Online Social Networks (OSNs). These websites are meant to extend the individual experience of society by bringing social activities to the internet, allowing people to discuss their favorite subjects and share their thoughts, opinions and feelings in a dis-

[1] `www.mixcloud.com`
[2] `22tracks.com`

tributed and independent way, making them an interesting source of many different kinds of information.

We define media item-to-item similarity based on user-generated data, assuming that two items are similar if they frequently co-occur in a user's profile history. For example, if two books are frequently read by the same people, they must have something in common.

We look specifically into two OSNs: Last.Fm and tvtag. Last.fm is an online social network for music fans that collects the songs listened by their users automatically. tvtag is a online social network for TV usage, where users check-in to the TV programs and movies they watched. For Last.fm we collected users' top 25 and top 100 most listened to songs for approximately 380K users, while for tvtag we collected the users' entire check-in history for 1.2M users.

Collected co-occurrence data is usually sparse (not all pairs of items will have co-occurred at least once in the collected dataset) and nevertheless might occupy a lot of memory space ($\Omega(n^2)$, where n is the size of the collection). To guarantee $O(n)$ space complexity and $O(1)$ query complexity of all-pairs similarity information, we transform the collected pairwise co-occurrence values into a multi-dimensional Euclidean space, by using non-linear dimensionality reduction [6].

From this Euclidean space it's possible to retrieve an item's most similar item in constant time. This allows the implementation of efficient navigation methods which are adequate for large collections and usage on devices with small computational power, such as mobile devices.

In this document we will focus on the similarity computation and dimensionality reduction of the co-occurrence data, evaluating the resulting Euclidean spaces created.

This paper is organized as follows. We discuss the used methodology in Section 2. In Section 3 we evaluate an embedding created for TV Domain based on tvtag data. In Section 4 we show maps created for the music domain based on Last.fm data collection. Finally, in Section 5, we present our conclusions.

Chapter 2

Methodology

2.1 Cosine similarity

In order to obtain similarity values between items in our database, we use collaborative filtering techniques. These techniques are based on the fact that items frequently co-occur in usage data, establishing similarity measures from that data. They have proven to be successful in many situations, and have been implemented in many renowned online systems, such as the Amazon recommendation engine.

Just as Amazon uses the fact that two items were bought by the same person to establish a relationship between them, our studies assume that two songs are related if they are frequently played by the same user. The same assumption will be used to analyze movies and series.

We use two social networks as data sources: Last.FM and tvtag. Last.FM is a music habit sharing network. The site offers the option of installing a "scrobbler", which is a small software listener that automatically logs the musical activity it detects (Spotify or iTunes, for instance). tvtag, on the other hand, requires that users voluntarily register their habits, by posting comments, "liking" or "checking in" to shows on their website profiles.

Simply counting the number of individual occurrences of a given pair of items to calculate pairwise similarity overestimates the similarity of popular items, which will have an elevated number of individual occurrences. That makes them clearly have a high probability of being associated to a user. To overcome that issue, it is necessary to transform the individual occurrence counts in a uniform similarity measure that represents the similarity between two given items regardless of their individual popularity. We chose to use Cosine coefficient.

Cosine is a measurement of the similarity between two vectors, expressing the cosine of the angle between them. The Cosine is a measurement of orientation, not magnitude: Two vectors with the same orientation have a cosine similarity of one, whereas two vectors 90 degrees apart have a

similarity of -1, regardless of their magnitude.

$$cos(A, B) = \frac{cooc(A, B)}{\sqrt{|A||B|}}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $|A|$ and $|B|$ are the number of individual occurrences of A and B and cooc(A,B) are the number of co-occurrences between them.

2.2 Embedding techniques

Among the dimensionality reduction we decided to initially use the Isomap [6] since it has good results in many problems, such as [5,7,8]. Also because one of its main properties is that, being a global dimensionality reduction technique, focuses on keeping near the points that were close in the initial space, and distant points that were far away. This property is very important for our problem, it is necessary that similar songs stay close, and different songs far away in the generated space.

2.2.1 Isomap

Isomap, first proposed by [6], is a global nonlinear dimensionality reduction method based on MDS [1], and follow these three steps.

Distances graph: The first part is to construct the neighborhood distances item-to-item graph. To build this graph we define the vertices as each track and the weight of an edge between track i and track j as $w(i, j) = 1 - cos(i, j)$ with a time complexity $O(ne)$, we define n as the total number of vertices and e the total number of links between them.

Geodesic distances matrix: Next we compute the shortest path between all vertices, building a nxn matrix, the time complexity of this step is $O(ne + n^2 logn)$.

Low-dimensional embedding: In order to build a low-dimensional embedding we use the classical multidimensional scaling (MDS) algorithm with complexity $O(n^3)$.

The final result is a low-dimensional Euclidean space where each point represents a track and the distance between two tracks represent how different they are.

2.2.2 L-Isomap

L-Isomap is an approximation of Isomap that addresses the last two steps time complexity choosing l landmark points, where $l << n$. With the distances graph, obtained in Step 1 of Isomap, we follow the next steps.

Geodesic distances matrix: Compute the shortest path between the vertices and the landmarks only, building a lxn matrix, so the time complexity of this step is lower $O(le + lnlogn)$.

Low-dimensional embedding: To build the low-dimensional embedding we use the Landmark MDS (LMDS) algorithm, where we find the Euclidean embedding in $O(ln^2)$ time [5].

Distance-based triangulation: To calculate the $l-n$ remaining points we use the low-dimensional space obtained in the previous step to triangulate these points as Step 3 in [2].

With this variant of Isomap we are able to build bigger maps in a lower amount of time, but with a decrease in the accuracy which will be analysed in Section 4.

To select the landmark points we used two different ways that will be analysed in Section 4:

- Random choice.
- MaxMin function: suggested by [2], s seed landmarks, chosen randomly such as $s << l$, and the other landmarks are chosen one at a time, where each new landmark maximizes the minimum distance between the landmarks and the unused data points.

Chapter 3

TV Domain

The method of collecting user data and constructing maps based on co-occurrence data can be applied to different media domains, such as movies, TV shows, books, or music. This chapter will evaluate the application of these methods on the TV domain based on data collected from tvtag and TMDB (The Open Movie Database).

Tvtag is an Online Social Network where users added their TV watching history checking-in, liking or disliking watched TV shows and movies. The data was collected between 2011 and 2012 and consists of 29M check-ins from users in approximately 3,000 TV programs and 7,000 movies.

We use the fact that one person likes two TV shows or movies as an indication of their similarity. The more two TV shows or movies co-occur in users likes, the more similar they are. To compensate for the popularity of the TV shows or movies, we used the cosine coefficient.

We reduce the dimensionality of the map using Isomap [6] and classic MDS [3].

3.1 Gender-based evaluation

To evaluate the quality of the generated map, we collected data from an independent source, TMDB, that contains gender for TV shows and movies. We categorized approximately 3000 shows with 26 different genders, with the majority of the shows belonging to more than one gender.

We expect items that are close in the map (similar items) to be of the same or similar gender. Since most items belong to more than one gender, it would not be enough to simply check if two items belong to the same gender, therefore we defined gender similarity using the co-occurrence of two genders in the users' like history.

The similarity of two genders g_i and g_j is defined as:

$$simBetweenGenders(g_i, g_j) = cos(g_i, g_j) = \frac{cooc(g_i, g_j)}{\sqrt{items(g_i)items(g_j)}}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $cooc(g_i, g_j)$ is the number of items that were classified with both genders and $items(g_i)$ and $items(g_j)$ are the number of items that were classified with at least gender g_i or at least gender g_j, respectively.

As in our database most items belong to more than one gender, we define the gender-based similarity between two items A and B as the average of the cosines between the genders of item A and item B:

$$genderBasedSimilarity(A, B) = \frac{\sum_{g_i \in GA, g_j \in GB} simBetweenGenders(g_i, g_j)}{kl}. \tag{3.2}$$

where $G_A =< g_1, g_2, \cdots g_k >$ and $G_B =< g_1, g_2, \cdots g_l >$

Gender gradient analysis in the map: For this metric, we used the following methodology: we considered $p = 20$ points closest to a straight line that goes from the origin of the embedding to a random chosen point in the Euclidean space (in d dimensions) ordered by the distance to the farthest point. We then check each consecutive pair of points (TV shows and movies) for their genders. The objective is to check how smooth is the transition between the genders in the trajectory. That is, we define the gender gradient by calculating the gender based similarity $genderBasedSimilarity(A, B)$ defined in 3.2 between two consecutive points of the straight line. In the end we use the average of the $genderBasedSimilarity$ values to define the "smoothness" of the line.

Figure 3.1(a) shows the approximation of the gender-based similarity distribution for 100 randomly chosen straight lines for 2, 3, 5, 7 and 10 dimensions. We can see that the gender gradient is smoother for a higher number of dimensions, indicating that the genders are more cohesively grouped in maps with higher dimensionality.

Gender predominance in a neighborhood: We randomly selected 50 items in the embedding and checked the gender distribution in their local neighborhood, observing different sizes of neighborhood. For each neighborhood size, we computed the gender-based similarity between the neighbors and the chosen point, using the definition 3.2. Figure 3.1(b) shows the average gender-based similarity between the points and their neighbors with 95% confidence. We can see that the similarity between a point and its neighbors is bigger for smaller neighborhoods and higher dimensionality.



(a) Gender gradient in randomly chosen straight lines.



(b) Neighborhood gender-based similarity.

Figure 3.1: Embedding quality analysis for dimensionality

Chapter 4

Music Domain

This chapter will evaluate the maps of media created for the domain of music based on data collected from Last.fm.

`Last.fm` provides a public API for collecting information about songs, artists, albums and user listening habits. For this purpose, items are represented by music tracks and item-to-item similarity reflects how often two tracks co-occurred in user profiles.

We will analyze how well the constructed Euclidean space represents music similarity. Note that there are no standard metrics for domain-specific embedding algorithms. Therefore, we first look into a domain-independent measure, the residual variance per dimension. Next, we evaluate artist similarity in local neighborhoods of increasing size.

In the created maps, songs are assigned coordinates and distances express their (global) similarity.

To analyse the two embedding techniques Isomap and L-Isomap, we will use two datasets, since the Isomap approach have a high computational cost and can not handle too much data.

The first dataset contains the users' top 25 most listened songs. From a total of 2,060,173 songs, 983,010 have MusicBrainz Identifiers (MBID)[1]. For the purpose of our study, we considered a subset of 83,180 tracks that co-occurred 5 or more times, forming a connected component of 62,352 songs.

The second dataset contains the users' top 100 most listened songs. From a total of 5,477,927 songs, we considered a subset of 1,520,771 tracks that co-occurred 2 or more times, forming a connected component of 1,457,786 songs.

The 62k dataset will be used to compare Isomap and L-Isomap, since we are not able to run the Isomap technique in the 1.4M dataset.

Figure 4.1 depicts the residual variance [6] associated with the k-th dimension output by the Isomap and L-Isomap algorithm with random landmarks using the 62k dataset, for $k \in [1, \ldots, 100]$. The stronger the decay

[1] MBID is a reliable and unambiguous form of music identification (`musicbrainz.org`).



Figure 4.1: Embedding distortion per dimension using Isomap and Random Landmarks L-Isomap with 62k dataset

of variance from dimension $k-1$ to k, the more significant is the addition of the k-th dimension to the map. It can be seen that the residual variance has the strongest drop in the first 20 dimensions; residual variance up to 20 dimensions tends to drop slowly, remaining almost constant for values up to 80 dimensions.

Increasing the number of landmarks from 200 to 20,000 reduces the residual variance specially for 20 to 60 number of dimensions. Comparing to the Isomap residual variance, L-Isomap provides a good approximation, specially with 20,000 landmarks. We also note that for 20,000 landmarks, the decrease in residual variance seems to reach a plateau around 70 dimensions, and the gain of adding more dimensions to the map is small.

For the 62k dataset we are able to conclude that with only 200 (3%) random landmarks there is a good approximation of Isomap.

Figure 4.2 depicts the residual variance using the MaxMin function choosing random seeds, Isomap and full random Landmarks choice. With only 100 seeds we were not able to get a good result comparing with the others, but using 2,000 seeds and 20,000 landmarks there is only a small difference between the full random 20,000 landmarks. Our hypothesis is that this dataset probably have a uniform distribution and so the random result is very close to the full Isomap technique and the MaxMin function. To avaliate better the performance of the 100 seeds test we need more experiments



Figure 4.2: Embedding distortion per dimension using Isomap, Random and MaxMin Landmarks L-Isomap with 62k dataset

and analyse a confidence interval.

To further analyze how space dimensionality impacts the item-to-item similarity, Figures 4.3 and 4.4 depict a box plot of the average cosine similarity of artists[2] in local neighborhoods of increasing size, for the 10-dimensional and 100-dimensional spaces, respectively. It can be seen that the median similarity of artists in neighborhoods of size 1 and 2 is 1, i.e., pairs and triples of closest songs tend to belong to the same artist, and the artist similarity gradually decreases as the size of the neighborhood increases, in both considered dimensions. This demonstrates that songs composed by the same and similar artists tend to be clustered on the map, whereas distant nodes tend to belong to dissimilar artists.

We show that the 100-dimensional space embedding has higher-quality similarity representation. However, less dimensions can be used if the map is used in resource-constraint environment, such as mobile devices [4].

To analyse the L-Isomap performance with more data, Figure 4.5 shows the residual variance using the random landmarks L-Isomap in the 1.4M dataset. Using 14,577 landmarks, 1% of the data, we hit a minimum of 66% of residual variance. Because L-Isomap is based on a uniform sampling

[2]We assume that the more frequently two artists co-occur in a user's listening history, the more similar they are. Then, songs from the same artist have similarity equal to 1.



Figure 4.3: Artist similarity per neighborhood size in 10D for the map created with Isomap in 62k dataset



Figure 4.4: Artist similarity per neighborhood size in 100D for the map created with Isomap in 62k dataset



Figure 4.5: Embedding distortion per dimension using Random Landmarks L-Isomap in 1.4M dataset



Figure 4.6: Artist similarity per neighborhood size in 100D for the map created with Isomap in 1.4M dataset

assumption of the data [5] we believe that the dataset have 'noise' points.

Figure 4.6 confirm our hypotesis, since the close neighbors are dissimilar in the average, but considering 32 or more neighbors it starts to get higher similarity.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

In this work we analyzed different nonlinear dimensionality reduction methods applied on the construction of media similarity maps showing that L-Isomap have a small decrease in accuracy but with a gain in time complexity. We intend to further investigate the 1.4M dataset distribution to remove the 'noisy' data and improve the music map quality.

The proposed techniques can be used in different domains, allowing the construction of similarity maps for different purposes. Also the number of dimensions have direct influence in the quality of the map, but after adding some dimensions the decrease in residual variance seems to reach a plateau and probably this is the intrinsic dimensionality of the data. The proposed structure allows:

- *Scalability gains:* To store all-pairs items similarity, one (multi-dimensional) coordinate needs to be stored for each item, therefore resulting in linear ($O(n)$) space complexity. Moreover, memory complexity is $O(k)$ for small subsets of k items, possibly stored on mobile devices, needing no global information to compute similarity values. This is in contrast to quadratic space requirements of other data structures, like graphs, which need to be all in memory to compute similarity in small subsets of items.

- *Performance gains:* With this structure the similarity between two items can be calculated in constant time $O(1)$.

- *Improved media navigation:* Knowing that similar items are close to each other we are able to implement new ways of navigation in a media collection.

Bibliography

[1] T. F. Cox and M. Cox. *Multidimensional Scaling*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2000.

[2] V. De Silva and J. B. Tenenbaum. Sparse multidimensional scaling using landmark points. Technical report, Technical report, Stanford University, 2004.

[3] J. B. Kruskal and M. Wish. *Multidimensional scaling*, volume 11. Sage, 1978.

[4] M. Kuhn, R. Wattenhofer, and S. Welten. Social audio features for advanced music retrieval interfaces. In *Proceedings of the international conference on Multimedia*, pages 411–420. ACM, 2010.

[5] V. D. Silva and J. B. Tenenbaum. Global versus local methods in nonlinear dimensionality reduction. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 705–712, 2002.

[6] J. B. Tenenbaum, V. Silva, and J. C. Langford. A Global Geometric Framework for Nonlinear Dimensionality Reduction. *Science*, 290(5500):2319–2323, 2000.

[7] L. J. van der Maaten, E. O. Postma, and H. J. van den Herik. Dimensionality reduction: A comparative review. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(1-41):66–71, 2009.

[8] S. Yan, D. Xu, B. Zhang, H.-J. Zhang, Q. Yang, and S. Lin. Graph embedding and extensions: a general framework for dimensionality reduction. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 29(1):40–51, 2007.